

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Paragraphs [0064] and [0085] have been amended.

Claim 1 is sought to be amended. Claims 12-14 are sought to be added. Upon entering the amendment, Claims 1-14 are pending in the application, with 1, 12, and 13 being the independent claims.

No new matter has been entered by any amendments shown above.

Based on the above amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statements

The Examiner is asked to consider and acknowledge the references cited on the Information Disclosure Statement filed September 20, 2004.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 10 were rejected: under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,528,355 to Maase et al. (“Maase”). Claims 3, 8, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maase in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,677,763 to Redmond (“Redmond”). Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maase in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,611,881 to Schmidt et al. (“Schmidt”). Claims 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maase. Applicants traverse these rejections.

Claim 1 recites at least a scanning optical device used in a system configured to capture image data representing biometric data ... wherein the optical device directs light that has totally internally reflected from an inside surface of a non-planar prism in the system onto the detection device ... wherein the image data of a print surface of up to

substantially all of a person's hand is captured while the hand is stationary on the optical device.

Maase, in particular, explicitly teaches away from being able to do this, where, as discussed above, it requires rotation of hand 18 between scans to capture both palm 62 and heel 70 of hand 18 (col. 2, lines 50-56). Maase teaches non-planar platen 12 includes an upper surface 28 having inner section 11a, b with a convex shape and an outer section 13a, b with a planar shape (cols. 3-6). These two shapes of upper surface 28 are required to allow capture of a palm 62 of a hand 18 with inner section 11a, b and a heel 70 of hand 18 with outer section 13a, b (cols. 2-6). The capture of both palm 62 and heel 70 is required to take place during two scans, one to capture palm 62 and one to capture heel 70 (col. 2, lines 50-56).

Therefore, Maase does not teach or suggest wherein biometric data corresponding to a print surface of a person's entire hand is captured without any movement of the hand, as recited in claim 1. None of the other applied patents remedy this deficiency of Maase. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1. Also, at least based on their dependency to claim 1, claims 2-11 should be found allowable over the applied patents.

New Claims 12-14

New independent claim 12 recites at least of a system including a scanning optical device ... wherein the directing device directs light that has totally internally reflected from an inside surface of a conical prism in the system onto the detection device.... None of the applied patents teach or suggest at least using a conical prism, as recited in claim 12. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner find claim 12 allowable.

New independent claim 13 recites at least a scanning optical device used in a system that captures up to substantially all of a print surface of a hand while the hand remains stationary in its preamble. None of the applied patents teach or suggest being able to capture an entire handprint image of a person's hand without movement of the

hand. Maase, in particular, explicitly teaches away from being able to do this, where, as discussed above, it requires rotation of hand 18 between scans to capture both palm 62 and heel 70 of hand 18 (col. 2, lines 50-56). Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner find claim 13 allowable. Also, based at least on its dependency from claim 13, claims 14 should also be found allowable.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Jason D. Eisenberg
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 43,447

Date: 2/10/05

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
SKGF_DC1: 339180.2